

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of May 16, 2007.

The drawings have been objected to as not being of sufficient quality to permit examination. Formal drawings are being submitted herewith and have been filed.

The list of references in the specification has been objected to as not being in proper form. The list will be submitted in proper form or the Examiner need not consider such references.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant has amended Paragraphs 20 and 22 to clarify how the aperture 14, the wig portion 20, and metal element 25 are positioned in the wig 10. The formal drawings are submitted also clarify the positions of such features. The specification has been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejection.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. Applicant has amended Claim 4 to now be dependent on Claim 2. Claim 4 has been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejection.

CLAIM REJECTION 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Young (U.S. Pat. # 3,495,603). In order to anticipate an invention, a reference must disclose each and every limitation of the invention. Claims 1 and 5 recite limitations not disclosed by Young. Claims 1 and 5 recite a main wig portion having an opening permitting natural hair to extend therethrough creating a natural hairline. Young does not disclose an element allowing natural hair to extend through the wig. Instead, Young

discloses a conventional skullcap to which hair is sewn. Young continues to disclose small portions of the skullcap where no hair is sewn, on which supplementary hairpieces can be attached. Young does not, however, disclose an element allowing natural hair to extend through the wig along a part. Young does not anticipate Claims 1 and 5 because it does not disclose each and every limitation recited therein.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 2-4 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young in view of Conley (U.S. Pat. # 1,583,778). Along with other requirements, a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires that the combined prior art references teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Young in view of Conley does not teach or suggest all the limitations in Claims 2-4 and 6. For instance, such claims all recite structural a limitation allowing natural hair to extend through the wig and a removable wig portion to cover the opening on occasions. As previously explained, Young does not anticipate such limitation which is embodied in the Omega shaped portion. Young in view of Conley also fails to teach or suggest such limitation. Conley relates to a frame replacing the strip of hair-lace used at the parting line of toupees. Notably, Conley does not teach any device permitting natural hair to extend through the wig. Further, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Young and Conley. Young in view of Conley does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in Claims 2-4 and 6, and accordingly, does not render such claims obvious.

SUMMARY

Applicant has amended Paragraphs 20 and 22 and Claim 4 to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 1-6 are believed patentable over the prior art

for reasons stated in the Remarks. Reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard A. Joel/

RICHARD A. JOEL

496 Kinderkamack Road

Oradell, NJ 07649

(201) 599-0588

Reg. No. 22212

Dated: August 16, 2007